

REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 14, 2005, has been received and reviewed.

Claims 1-63 are currently pending in the application. Of these, claims 26-63 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-25, which have been considered, stand rejected.

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

Please note that a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement was filed in the above-referenced application on February 25, 2005, but that the undersigned attorney has not yet received any indication that the references cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement have been considered in the above-referenced application. It is respectfully requested that the references cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement of February 25, 2005, be considered and made of record in the above-referenced application and that an initialed copy of the Form PTO/SB/08A that accompanied that Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement be returned to the undersigned attorney as evidence of such consideration.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for reciting subject matter that is allegedly not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The as-filed drawings of an application may be relied upon to provide an adequate written description of claimed subject matter.

Specifically, it has been asserted that the as-filed specification does not provide support for recitation in independent claim 1 that a detection device is positioned in a cone of collection angles. It is respectfully submitted that the specification of the above-referenced application does provide an adequate written description of positioning a detection device in a cone of collection angles. As a nonlimiting example, Fig. 5 illustrates collection angles as a group of dashed lines, as well as a detector 502 positioned within the collection angles.

In view of this disclosure, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as well as claims 2-25 depending therefrom, comply with the written description requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 by reasonably conveying to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejections of claims 1-25 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1 through 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for reciting subject matter which is purportedly indefinite.

It has been asserted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not readily understand the meaning of a “detection device positioned in a cone of collection angles,” as recited in independent claim 1.


One of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand, from viewing the as-filed drawings of the above-referenced application, what is meant by the recitation, “a . . . detection device positioned in a cone of collection angles,” as the Fig. 5 of the above-referenced application clearly illustrates the placement of a detection device 502 within the collection angles that are illustrated as dashed lines.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, and claims 2-25 depending therefrom, comply with the definiteness requirement of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections of claims 1-25 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1-25 and 26-63 is allowable. An early notice of the allowability of each of these claims is respectfully solicited, as is an indication that the above-referenced application has been passed for issuance. If any issues preventing allowance of the above-referenced application remain which might be resolved by way of a telephone conference, the Office is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Brick G. Power
Registration No. 38,581
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT, PC
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: June 14, 2005

BGP/dlm:eg
Document in ProLaw